

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application, of which claims 3, 6, 9, 12 and 15 have been withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated May 10, 2010.

As To The Merits:

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejection:

claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takayama et al. (US Publication No. 20010019960) in view of Chinomi et al. (US Publication No. 20040059498).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The cited reference of Takayama et al. discloses a system providing services which are limited in a specific area, in which a service database stores a service program executing various services, such as a sightseeing guidance at a tourist resort or an information guidance at a place for an event, and an area allowing the service program to execute with relevancy to each other, and when the service database receives a service selection information requested by a mobile station and, a current position information of the mobile station, it judges the allowed, area corresponding to the service program executing a selected service and the current position of the

mobile station. If the mobile station is within the allowed area, the requested service is executed and if not, the requested service is prohibited from executing.

Since Takayama's server does not provide a service list, which is similar to the content guide information of the present invention, with the mobile station in advance, the mobile station communicates with the server, requests to provide the service list with the mobile station and then selects a desired service by referring to the service list. The mobile station can get the selected service in case of being in the area where the selected service is provided, but can not get the selected service in case of not being in the area where the selected service is provided. The mobile station can not get information in advance that which service is receivable in which area, because of not being provided the service list by the server.

The navigation system disclosed by Chinomi et al. has a construction that if a user (mobile station) establishes a selection criterion of content receiving area after selecting a content from a content list, a server transmits plural content receiving areas, where the content is downloadable, to the user corresponding to the selection criterion and then the user selects the desired content receiving area. Chinomi's system has an object that the content is downloadable at any content receiving area and provide the user the content receiving area, where is close to the route of the user.

Therefore, Chinomi's system does not provide a content downloadable area with the user, as disclosed in the present invention, but provides with the user information with respect to content receiving area. The meaning of the word "area" in Chinomi is a facilities in which a wireless access point is established, and is different from geographical content providing area where the content is downloadable, as disclosed in the present invention.

Chinomi shows that the content receiving location is a range having only several dozens of meters in which the user can receive a radio wave from the access point, and only forms a receivable area according to the communication range by using a wireless LAN, and further, since the receivable area is changed by the receiving sensitivity of terminal device, Chinomi can not specify a specific geographical area as the downloadable area. In Chinomi's art, since the access point is the center of the receiving area and the location of the access point is important, the location of the access point decides whether the content is downloadable or not.

In contrast, in the present invention, area information that the content is downloadable is decided geographically and it is decided that the download is possible or not, based on the location information of the mobile phone terminal.

Therefore, the present invention is not obvious over the combination of Takayama et al. and Chinomi et al.

Application No. 10/582,852
Art Unit: 2617

Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.116
Attorney Docket No. 062665

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
/THOMAS E. BROWN/

Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,450
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/nrp